

Application No. 10/786,578
Amendment dated April 6, 2006
Reply to Advisory Action mailed March 13, 2006

Docket No. CM06657LL

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Rejection - 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1 and 4-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by US 6,207,475 (Lin).

Applicants have amended the independent claims in order to more clearly define the invention. No new matter has been added. Support for this amendment is found in FIG. 1. In claim 1, as amended, Applicants recite (numerals inserted to facilitate review):

An apparatus for attaching a solid solder element (106) to a solderable substrate (102), comprising:

an adhesive material (104) applied to a portion of the solid solder element (106) so as to overlap with the solderable substrate (102) outside of a predefined area reserved for subsequent component (108) placement, the adhesive material (104) immobilizing the solid solder element (106) during reflow, the adhesive material (104) not contacting the component (108).

Independent claims, 4 and 7 have been similarly amended. The advantages are discussed on page 4, lines 1-5 and page 6, lines 15-18 of the specification including improved alignment and fewer stack up failures. Lin's device is structurally different from the claimed device. In the Lin reference, items (48) are solder balls and item (84) is an underfill material. The Examiner is equating the underfill material (84) of Lin to Applicants' claimed adhesive material, and the Examiner is also equating the solder balls (48) of Lin to Applicants' claimed solid solder element. Lin's underfill material (84) is located underneath and touches the IC die (44). Since the cited art does not teach or suggest that which is claimed in the present application, Applicants submit that the rejection is now overcome.

Accordingly claims 1, 4 and 7 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Claims 5 and 6 provide further limitations to what is believed to be an allowable claim 4 and hence are also in condition for allowance.

Application No. 10/786,578
Amendment dated April 6, 2006
Reply to Advisory Action mailed March 13, 2006

Docket No. CM06657LL

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

The Applicants believe that the subject application, as amended, is in condition for allowance. Such action is earnestly solicited by the Applicants.


In the event that the Examiner deems the present application non-allowable, it is requested that the Examiner telephone the Applicant's attorney or agent at the number indicated below so that the prosecution of the present case may be advanced by the clarification of any continuing rejection.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account 502117, Motorola, Inc, with any fees which may be required in the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

April 6, 2006

Motorola, Inc.
8000 West Sunrise Boulevard
Law Department - MD1610
Plantation, Florida 33322
Customer Number: 24273
Attachments:

By: 
Barbara R. Dautre, Esq.
Reg. No.: 39,505
Tel: 954-723-6449
Fax: 954-723-3871
E-Mail: docketing.florida@motorola.com